



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

DR

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/023,865	12/21/2001	Gerald Delgorgue	P21708	5631
7055	7590	01/13/2004	EXAMINER	
GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN, P.L.C. 1950 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE RESTON, VA 20191			STASHICK, ANTHONY D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3728	
DATE MAILED: 01/13/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/023,865	DELGORGUE ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit	
Anthony D Stashick	3728	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication app ars on the cover sheet with the correspondenc address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____ . 6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claim 16 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 16 contains the repetitive term "wherein" in lines 2 and 3 of the claim. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

3. Claims 1-3, 6-8, 11-14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kogert et al. 3,570,149. Kogert et al. '149 discloses all the limitations of the claims including the following: assembling an upper on the sole (see col. 1, lines 54-60); applying at least one layer of flexible or semi-rigid polymer in a liquid state in predetermined areas of the upper (see col. 2, lines 7-11); the predetermined areas are less than an entirety of the upper (where necessary can be any portion of the upper); drying the article of footwear (col. 2,

Art Unit: 3728

lines 7-11, multiple layers can only be applied if the preceding layer has dried, otherwise not separate layers); applying the polymer with a brush (see painting in col. 2, lines 12-13 and 22-24); applying the polymer by spraying (see col. 2, lines 12-13 and 20-24); liquefying the polymer by heating (col. 2, line 41); the polymer is made of polyurethane (col. 2, line 41); the upper comprises mesh material (textile material includes mesh material); upper comprises three-dimensional mesh material (multiple layers makes it three dimensional with a length, width and thickness); the material of the upper being aeratable (see col. 2, line 2, porous is aeratable); elastically compressible air space between layers of upper (an multiple layer of textile material will have air located between it as it consists of material and air spaces).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 4, 9-10, 16-20, 24-26 and 34-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kogert et al, 3,570,149 as applied above in view of FR Lentz 720,292 (Lentz '292). Kogert '149 discloses all the limitations of the claims substantially as claimed except for the polymer layer straddling the sole and upper, the polymer layer varying in height along the length of the upper, the polymer layer raising in height along the rear of the upper. Lentz '292 teaches that a layer applier to the external side of a shoe can cover the shoe sole and upper with the layer varying in height along the upper from the front to the heel of the shoe (see Figure 3). Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the external layer of protective material vary in height from the front to the heel of the shoe while covering the sole and upper, as taught by Lentz '292, to the shoe of Kogert '149, to prevent entrance of fluid into the shoe between the upper and sole as well as to give added support to the user's foot when placed within the shoe.

6. Claims 5 and 27-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kogert et al. 3,570,149 as applied above. Kogert teaches that the outer coating material can be polyurethane. Applicant, in claim 7 of the instant application,

Art Unit: 3728

admits that all the materials claimed in claims 27033 are equivalents of polyurethane, at least in the properties desired for application to waterproof a shoe. Therefore, since the material of claims 27-33 are accepted equivalents of the polyurethane used by Kogert '149, Kogert '149 would anticipate the use of these materials.

With respect to the limitation of claim 5, and the diluting of the material, Kogert '149 teaches that different areas of the boot upper can be coated with polyurethane of different porosities. Since a layer of different porosity of polyurethane would require the dilution of the polyurethane with another material, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to dilute the polyurethane to whatever degree necessary to give the desired porosity of the material for the given portions of the boot.

7. Claims 15, 22 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the references as applied to claims 13 and 21 above in view of Burt 6,401,364. The references as applied to claims 13 and 21 above disclose all the limitations of the claims except for the aeratable material being made of a pair of spaced-apart layers of mesh fabric and a fibrous layer located between them with an air space. Burt '364 teaches that

the breathable upper of a shoe can be made of an internal mesh layer 40 and an external mesh layer 20 (see col. 4, lines 35-60) with a reinforcing layer located in between. The reference states "the internal layer 40 is made of a three-dimensional mesh which is more comfortable to the wearer than mesh. The three-dimensional mesh is a loose configuration of fibers 42 extending substantially perpendicularly between a soft porous inner layer 41 and an outer porous layer 43, which provide a porous layer that allows gases, such as air, and liquids, such as perspiration, to travel ...". Therefore, Burt '364 teaches that the upper of a shoe can be made of a three-dimensional mesh layer with fibrous material (and air) located between the internal and external layers. Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, to make the upper of the Kogert '149, out of the material suggested by Burt '364 to allow for a light and breathable upper to be reinforced and still be light in weight.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. The applicant's arguments with respect to Kogert '149 are addressed specifically in the rejections above.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Telephone inquiries regarding the status of applications or other general questions, by persons entitled to the information, "should be directed to the group clerical personnel and not to the examiners. In as much as the official records and applications are located in the clerical section of the examining groups, the clerical personnel can readily provide status information without contacting the examiners", M.P.E.P. 203.08. The Group clerical receptionist number is (703) 308-1148.

If in receiving this Office Action it is apparent to applicant that certain documents are missing, e.g., copies of references cited, form PTO-1449, form PTO-892, etc., requests for copies of such papers or other general questions should be directed to Tech Center 3700 Customer Service at (703) 306-5648, email CustomerService3700@uspto.gov.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anthony D Stashick whose telephone number is 703-308-3876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00 am-4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mickey Yu can be reached on 703-308-2672. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-1148.

Other helpful telephone numbers are listed for applicant's benefit.

Allowed Files & Publication	(703) 305-8322
Assignment Branch	(703) 308-9287
Certificates of Correction	(703) 305-8309
Drawing Corrections/Draftsman	(703) 305-8404/8335
Fee Increase Questions	(703) 305-5125
Intellectual Property Questions	(703) 305-8217
Petitions/Special Programs	(703) 305-9282
Terminal Disclaimers	(703) 305-8408
Informal Fax for 3728	(703) 308-7769

If the information desired is not provided above, or has been changed, please do not call the examiner (this is the latest information provided to him) but the general information help line below.

Art Unit: 3728



Anthony D Stashick
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3728

ADS

January 12, 2004